

**ROCKY FLATS CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD****MINUTES OF STUDY SESSION****July 19, 1999**

---

**FACILITATOR:** Laura Till

Tom Marshall called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m.

**BOARD / EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS PRESENT:** Susan Barron, Ray Betts, Shawn Burke, Eugene DeMayo, Gerald DePoorter, Joe Downey, Tom Gallegos, Victor Holm, Bill Kossack, Tom Marshall, Mary Mattson, LeRoy Moore, David Navarro, Bryan Taylor / Steve Gunderson, Anna Martinez, John Rampe**BOARD / EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ABSENT:** Tom Davidson, Mary Harlow, Jim Kinsinger, Linda Sikkema / Tim Rehder**PUBLIC / OBSERVERS PRESENT:** Bruce Dahm (City of Broomfield); Jeff Eggleston (citizen); Alan Trenary (citizen); Jack Hoopes (Kaiser-Hill); Ken Korkia (CAB staff); Erin Rogers (CAB staff); Deb Thompson (CAB staff)**PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD:**

**Comment:** Gerald DePoorter: I want to thank the Department of Energy and Kaiser-Hill for having the Mound Plume Site Visitor's Day. This was a full-morning presentation on July 8, and DOE went to a lot of time and expense to put together. They put together a very good packet of information, had speakers that explained what was going on, took us out to the site and showed us what was going on. There were people taking samples there so we could really see what was happening and see where some of the results come from that we see in reports. I was disappointed that a lot more people didn't take advantage of this, because it's a good opportunity to meet with representatives and to have your questions answered.

**TRU WASTE EA RECOMMENDATIONS DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL:** Two Board members formed a sub-group to review the TRU Waste Environmental Assessment, and prepare comments and a recommendation for the Board's approval. The public comment period on this document ends July 23. The Board approved a revised recommendation stating that RFCAB recognizes the need for developing additional onsite storage capacity. The Board in general stated it does support the Preferred Alternative as stated in the EA, which is to refurbish existing building(s).

Prior to the meeting, Board members were given a letter from the American Federation of Government Employees, the local chapter that represents government employees at the site. Approximately 225 non-radiation office employees work in Building 460, one of the buildings under consideration for additional waste storage. Because of issues raised by the union, the Board added language to its recommendation stating that it would not recommend waste storage in any existing buildings if it would cause increased radiation exposure to non-radiation workers. RFCAB also recommended that DOE consult with the

government workers' union prior to making any decision about the use of Building 460 for waste storage.

The Board also agreed that tents should not be used for waste storage because of safety and security issues. In addition, RFCAB believes that the cost of building a new facility is not justified considering DOE's policy decision to ship all this waste to WIPP as soon as possible. The Board noted that security is an important factor when considering the storage of TRU waste, and encouraged DOE to factor that into its planning criteria, especially since the candidate buildings are outside the Protected Area.

#### **PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION ON PROPOSED PLANS FOR CLOSURE**

**CAPS AT ROCKY FLATS:** As part of its continued discussion on cleanup levels and the use of caps, the Board received a presentation from Lane Butler of Kaiser-Hill on the use of caps, or covers, as a remedial option at the site. The use of caps is only one component of the site's plans for cleanup. Decisions to be made about their use are still at least a year or two away. In the 2006 Baseline, only a few areas are being considered for caps — the Solar Ponds, the existing landfill, and the old landfill located near Woman Creek on the south side of the Industrial Area. In addition, other areas within the Industrial Area may be candidates for caps or covers, depending on the amount of contamination that might be discovered following characterization studies.

Caps, or covers, are a constructed surface barrier of natural and/or manufactured material that are designed to provide long-term minimization of migration of liquids through a landfill, and to provide long-term containment of contaminants or other source materials. They are intended to be impermeable. Two types are generally in use:

1. RCRA Subtitle "C" caps — for hazardous and low level/low level mixed waste, with an impermeable clay barrier and geomembranes, which prevent water penetration.
2. RCRA Subtitle "D" — for municipal solid waste, with a compacted soil layer that minimizes water penetration.

The traditional RCRA caps are expensive, especially the clay caps. Many have failed and leaked regardless of the climate or site-specific geology, because the clay and compacted soil dries and cracks. There are other alternative cover designs being developed:

1. Geosynthetic clay cover, which would replace a clay liner with a composite membrane/clay liner.
2. Capillary barrier, made up of graded layers of sand, gravel and topsoil to hold water, enhance evapo-transpiration, lateral drainage, and prevent vertical water penetration.
3. Anisotropic barrier, a layering of capillary barriers to hold water, limit downward movement and encourage lateral movement (uses various soil properties and compaction techniques).
4. Evapo-transpiration (ET) cover, which depends on the soil to hold water and promote evapo-transpiration, similar to a RCRA "D" but thicker and involving less compaction.

At this time, the site considers both the Anisotropic and Evapo-transpiration designs to be the most advantageous, because with these covers it takes a short time to establish vegetation and it is easy to size and contour them to site-specific conditions.

Next the Board began a discussion of whether or not it could support the use of caps, or covers, as a cleanup measure at the site. Following are some of the comments made by the Board as part of its discussion.

- Should only use caps or covers under drastic circumstances or as a last resort
- Phytoremediation may be an alternative
- Caps should be a temporary measure; a timeframe needs to be considered
- This may amount to a "dirty closure" with budgetary restraints and political decisions driving the choice
- Some hot spots may be released during remediation

Finally, the Board developed a statement to summarize its position on the use of caps or covers:

*In general, RFCAB does not support the use of caps unless they are shown to be the only option available as a temporary measure to stop the spread of contamination.*

This statement will become part of the Board's Vision document.

**PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD:** No comments were received.

**PRELIMINARY DISCUSSION OF DRAFT RFCAB VISION FOR ROCKY FLATS CLOSURE:** The Board has been working since October on developing a "Vision" for Rocky Flats. Included in the packet for this meeting was the first draft of the Vision document, which staff has prepared. The document includes background information and an introduction to the Board's Vision, the closure plan assumptions, areas the Board chose to discuss, a historical write-up of the process RFCAB went through in developing the Vision, and finally the key elements that make up the Board's Vision. Board members made no significant comments at this time. Staff will continue to refine the draft document, add language that the Board developed during its July meetings, then bring the document back for another review at the August meeting.

**STEWARDSHIP PROPOSAL:** In June, DOE asked RFCAB and the Coalition of Local Governments to co-convene a stewardship discussion. RFCAB agreed in a letter sent to Jessie Roberson, and an interim working group of Board members developed a proposal then later met with Coalition staff. The proposal is for the Board and Coalition to form an independent group of representatives from either organization, as well as other interested parties. The group will produce a final product to be considered by each participating organization. An independent facilitator will lead the group. A means of funding will be established by the group, and the timeframe for discussions and release of the final product will be part of the decision-making process.

Because of the Board's policies on representation, and because the Board is so diverse, it may be difficult for any one individual to represent RFCAB, especially for matters on which the Board has not yet taken a position. But it is important for the Board to be involved in stewardship issues, and it may be necessary for RFCAB to consider sending representatives. This proposal is to allow a representation "team" of no less than five Board members to function on the stewardship dialogue group. There will be established a method of communication and feedback between the team and the Board, including developing a foundation and groundrules for member participation. Any final product, however, will be

subject to final Board approval.

The Board approved the proposal, but noted that it would like to include a review and evaluation of how the process is working after six months. This will not become part of the proposal, but rather is an internal process for RFCAB.

#### **EXECUTIVE SESSION:**

- Membership Committee. The Membership Committee recommended, and the Board approved, adding a new member — Markuené Sumler. Markuené lives in Broomfield, and is a program administrator at the National Jewish Medical and Research Center in Denver. She also serves as a member on the Board of Directors for the CU-Denver Alumni Association. Markuené has a BS in Biology and an MS in Health Administration. Ms. Sumler will serve as a representative of the Health Industry.

#### **NEXT MEETING:**

**Date:** August 5, 6 - 9:30 p.m.

**Location:** College Hill Library, Front Range Community College, 3705 West 112<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Westminster

**Agenda:** Update from DNFSB; building rubble RSOP recommendation; final discussion on cleanup phases end-states; second review of draft Vision document

#### **ACTION ITEM SUMMARY: ASSIGNED TO:**

1. Make changes to TRU Waste EA recommendation, and forward to DOE - Erin Rogers
2. Continue to write and revise Vision document, back to Board for second review - Staff

#### **MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:35 P.M. \***

(\* Taped transcript of full meeting is available in CAB office.)

#### **RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:**

---

Mary Harlow, Secretary  
Rocky Flats Citizens Advisory Board

---

The Rocky Flats Citizens Advisory Board is a community advisory group that reviews and provides recommendations on cleanup plans for Rocky Flats, a former nuclear weapons plant outside of Denver,

Colorado.

[Top of Page](#) | [Index of Meeting Minutes](#) | [Home](#)

[Citizens Advisory Board Info](#) | [Rocky Flats Info](#) | [Links](#) | [Feedback & Questions](#)